CARRY THE STRUGGLE AGAINST KHRUSHCHOV REVISIONISM THROUGH TO THE END

— ON THE OCCASION OF THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE PUBLICATION OF "A PROPOSAL CONCERNING THE GENERAL LINE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT"

HX
632
A1
W9
NO.99

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

Ex libris
universitatis
albertaensis

CARRY THE STRUGGLE AGAINST KHRUSHCHOV REVISIONISM THROUGH TO THE END

— On the Occasion of the Second Anniversary of the Publication of "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement"

by the Editorial Departments of *Renmin Ribao* (*People's Daily*) and *Hongqi* (*Red Flag*)

(June 14, 1965)

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1965

Printed in the People's Republic of China

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

TIME flies. Two full years have elapsed since the publication by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China of its "Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement".

Two years are a mere instant in the long history of the international communist movement. But what fierce struggles and what tremendous changes these years have witnessed!

Two years ago, the leaders of the CPSU headed by Khrushchov stirred up a gust of ill wind in the international communist movement in order to impose on the fraternal Parties the revisionist line which they had formulated at the 20th and the 22nd Congresses of the CPSU, that is, the general line of "peaceful coexistence", "peaceful competition" and "peaceful transition", and of the "state of the whole people" and the "party of the entire people". They repeatedly sounded the call for a general onslaught against China, against communism and against the people. They stage-managed anti-Marxist-Leninist farces at the Congresses of five European fraternal Parties. They directed more than forty Communist Parties to launch wanton attacks on the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist Parties. It seemed as if "the city might crumble under the mass of dark clouds".

The "Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement" put forward by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party on June 14, 1963 held aloft the torch of revolution, penetrated the dense fog of Khrushchov revisionism and defended the purity of Marxism-Leninism.

The Proposal of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party was a reply to a letter from the Central Committee of the CPSU of March 30, 1963. In its letter, the

Central Committee of the CPSU systematically set forth its views on a number of major issues of our epoch and, in particular, raised the question of the general line of the international communist movement. The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party considered it a very good thing that this question was raised. For the differences that had arisen since the 20th Congress of the CPSU between ourselves and all other Marxist-Leninist Parties on the one hand and the leaders of the CPSU on the other were not differences on this or that particular problem but differences of principle on a number of fundamental problems of the world revolution in our epoch, that is, differences concerning the general line of the international communist movement. The essence of the differences was whether or not the people still living under the imperialist and capitalist system, who comprise two-thirds of the world's population, need to make revolution, and whether or not the people already on the socialist road, who comprise one-third of the world's population, need to carry their revolution forward to the end. It concerned the fundamental principles which the entire international communist movement and every political party of the proletariat must adhere to and the basic tasks they must perform.

In "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement", the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party upheld the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism, the common road of the October Revolution and the revolutionary principles of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement; on the one hand it systematically dissected the theory and general line of the Khrushchov revisionists and exposed their betrayal of Marxism-Leninism and of the cause of the proletarian world revolution, and on the other hand made a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the contemporary world contradictions, gave Marxist-Leninist answers to a number of questions concerning the world revolution in our epoch, and put forward a Marxist-Leninist general line of the international communist

movement diametrically opposed to the general line of Khrushchov revisionism.

The general line of the international communist movement proposed by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party may be summarized as follows:

> Workers of all countries, unite; workers of the world, unite with the oppressed peoples and oppressed nations; oppose imperialism and reaction in all countries; strive for world peace, national liberation, people's democracy and socialism; consolidate and expand the socialist camp; bring the proletarian world revolution step by step to complete victory; and establish a new world without imperialism, without capitalism and without the exploitation of man by man.

This general line is one of resolute revolutionary struggle by the people of all countries, one of carrying the proletarian world revolution forward to the very end; it is the line of effective struggle against imperialism and in defence of world peace. It is the Marxist-Leninist general line for winning both complete victory in the revolution and lasting world peace.

The Proposal of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party was a programmatic document. It drew a clear line between Marxism-Leninism and Khrushchov revisionism on a number of major problems of the contemporary world revolution and made a great theoretical contribution to the struggle against Khrushchov revisionism.

The publication of "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement" marked the beginning of a new stage in the struggle against Khrushchov revisionism. Since its publication, together with the other Marxist-Leninist fraternal Parties, the Chinese Communist Party has carried on a great public debate and launched a general counter-attack against Khrushchov revisionism. The Proposal was a major turning point in the struggle between

Marxism-Leninism and modern revisionism. It was a turning point in the transition from the emergence and growth of Khrushchov revisionism, and indeed of the entire modern revisionist trend after World War II, to its complete bankruptcy.

The two years since the publication of the Proposal by the Central Committee of our Party have been years of open polemics and fierce struggle, on an unprecedented scale, between the Marxist-Leninist Parties and Marxist-Leninists of the world and the Khrushchov revisionists. In the first sixteen months the struggle was directed mainly against the leaders of the CPSU headed by Khrushchov, and in the last eight months mainly against the new leaders of the CPSU who pursue Khrushchov revisionism without Khrushchov. The struggle has been a process in which Khrushchov revisionism has been incessantly exposed and discredited and in which Marxism-Leninism has incessantly registered progress and victories.

The open polemics and fierce struggle over the past two years have centred on the following three questions:

First, whether to adhere to revolutionary Marxism-Leninism or to anti-revolutionary revisionism. After we put forward the Proposal concerning the general line of the international communist movement, the Khrushchov revisionists published their "Open Letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to All Party Organizations, All Communists of the Soviet Union", strenuously defending their general line of "peaceful coexistence", "peaceful competition", "peaceful transition", the "state of the whole people" and the "party of the entire people" and fiercely attacking the Chinese Communist Party and the other Marxist-Leninist Parties. The great value of this Open Letter lay in the fact that it gave all Marxist-Leninists the right openly to expose Khrushchov revisionism and provided them with the negative material with which to develop their systematic criticism of its general line. Like the ill-fated magician of legend, the Khrushchov

revisionists conjured up the "genie" by their incantations but could find no way of conjuring it away. The Marxist-Leninists of all countries have carried on the polemics with the Khrushchov revisionists in various ways. We, on our part, wrote nine articles in ten months commenting on the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU. We presented facts and reasoned arguments on a number of major questions of principle concerning the international communist movement, stripping Khrushchov of his mantle of Marxism-Leninism and further exposing him to the people of the world in his true colours as a renegade from Marxism-Leninism.

Secondly, whether to unite with the people of the world against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys or to unite with U.S. imperialism and its lackeys against the people of the world. Since the publication of the Open Letter, the Khrushchov revisionists committed a series of acts of treachery, the most glaring of which was the signing of the treaty on the partial halting of nuclear tests with the United States and Britain. This was a major exposure of the Khrushchov revisionists' betrayal of the interests of the Soviet people, the peoples of all the socialist countries and all the peace-loving people of the world. Firmly grasping the opportunity provided by the treaty and by other acts of treachery, the Chinese Communist Party and the Marxist-Leninists of the world fully exposed the Khrushchov revisionists' alignment with the forces of war against the forces of peace, their alignment with the imperialist forces against the socialist forces, their alignment with the United States against China, and their alignment with the reactionaries everywhere against the people everywhere. The facts have proved that Soviet-U.S. co-operation for the domination of the world is the soul of the Khrushchov revisionist general line.

Thirdly, whether to have unity or a split. Betraying Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, the Khrushchov revisionists have become the greatest splitters in history. They held a plenum of the Central Committee of

the CPSU in February 1964 at which they made an anti-Chinese report and adopted an anti-Chinese resolution, proclaiming that they were going to take "collective measures" against the Chinese Communist Party. After that, they actively plotted unilaterally to convene a preparatory meeting for an international meeting of the fraternal Parties and then the meeting itself, and they got ready to precipitate an open split in the international communist movement. Together with many other fraternal Parties, the Chinese Communist Party thoroughly exposed their scheme for a split and adamantly boycotted their divisive meeting. In its letter of July 28, 1964 to the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China pointed out: "The day your so-called meeting takes place will be the day you step into your grave."

Proceeding from betrayal in theory to betrayal in action and from political to organizational splitting activities, the Khrushchov revisionists have gone farther and farther down the road of destruction. Events developed so quickly that Khrushchov was driven off the stage of history before we finished our comments on the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU and before the leaders of the CPSU had time to convene their small schismatic meeting.

In these two years, imperialism headed by the United States has further revealed its aggressive nature, the people's revolutionary struggles have surged forward in Asia, Africa, Latin America and elsewhere, Khrushchov revisionism has been increasingly discredited and Marxism-Leninism has won one victory after another. All this proves that the general line of the international communist movement which we proposed is correct, that the struggle against Khrushchov revisionism is necessary, and that the views of the Chinese Communist Party and Comrade Mao Tse-tung on the major issues of our epoch stand up to the test of practice.

Khrushchov's downfall was a signal victory for Marxism-Leninism. But it meant neither the disappearance of

Khrushchov revisionism nor the end of the struggle against Khrushchov revisionism.

The new leaders of the CPSU had no alternative but to remove Khrushchov from his post, but they took over Khrushchov revisionism in its entirety. They have repeatedly declared that the line laid down at the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the CPSU and in the Programme of the CPSU was, is and will be their "sole and immutable line in all domestic and external policy".[1] When the Chinese Party and Government delegation was in Moscow for the celebration of the 47th anniversary of the October Revolution, the new leaders of the CPSU told us that there was not a shade of difference between them and Khrushchov on the question of the international communist movement and in their attitude towards China. All their deeds in the eight months since their assumption of office have shown that they are indeed following in Khrushchov's footsteps and that they are carrying out Khrushchov revisionism without Khrushchov.

It is not at all strange that after his downfall Khrushchov's successors should go on doing the same things as he did. Marxist-Leninists pointed out long ago that the emergence of Khrushchov revisionism is not due to a few individuals and is not an accidental phenomenon, but has deep social roots. It is a product both of the inundation of the Soviet Union by domestic capitalist forces, and of the policies pursued by the imperialists.

After Khrushchov's ascent to power, this arch-schemer gradually usurped the leadership of the Soviet Party and state, and as a consequence the new bourgeois elements in Soviet society gradually became a privileged bourgeois stratum opposed to the Soviet people. This privileged stratum is the social base of the Khrushchov revisionist clique. And this clique is its political representative.

---

[1] Brezhnev's speech at a mass rally in Moscow, October 19, 1964.

The privileged stratum in the Soviet Union got rid of Khrushchov not because he practised revisionism, but because he was too stupid and disreputable, and because he was impaled on a dilemma in internal and external affairs, was opposed and condemned by the masses, deserted by his followers, and threatened by a growing crisis, and therefore could not muddle on any longer. The revisionist line was like a ramshackle cart which the rash fool Khrushchov was driving unsteadily, and this inevitably endangered the dominant position of the Soviet privileged stratum. Thus it came to pass that Khrushchov himself became an obstacle to the pursuit of Khrushchov revisionism. To protect the interests of the Soviet privileged stratum and press on with the revisionist line, it became imperative to oust Khrushchov and put others in his place.

As a matter of fact, the new leaders who have replaced Khrushchov are still Khrushchov's old cast. The political careers of its chief members are inseparably linked with Khrushchov. Are they not the same men who, along with Khrushchov, were active in attacking Stalin and in working for the restoration of capitalism? Are they not the same men who, along with Khrushchov, made vigorous attacks on the Chinese Communist Party and other Marxist-Leninist fraternal Parties? Are they not the same men who, along with Khrushchov, strove to split the socialist camp and the international communist movement? And are they not the same men who, along with Khrushchov, colluded with U.S. imperialism against the people's revolutionary struggles in all countries?

Now these old actors face the very awkward and difficult problem of how to deck themselves out as new ones. Having got rid of Khrushchov, they must make certain gestures and play certain tricks to show that they are somewhat different from Khrushchov. But because they are political representatives of the privileged bourgeois stratum in the Soviet Union, just as Khrushchov was, they can only act in conformity with

the interests of that stratum and pursue a revisionist line; there can be no difference between them and Khrushchov on this fundamental issue. Thus, for the past eight months they have been in a predicament, contradicting themselves all the time.

They are unable to explain the contradictions in their own statements. They say one thing today and another tomorrow; and every time they give themselves a slap in the face. They say that U.S. imperialism is "the aggressor", "the international gendarme" and "the main force of war and aggression in our time", but in the same breath they aver that the Johnson Administration is "sensible", "moderate" and can be expected to "take concrete steps towards the further improvement of the world political climate".[1] They say that they want to oppose U.S. imperialism, but at the same time they declare that there exist "sufficiently broad areas for co-operation"[2] between the Soviet Union and the United States. At times they profess condemnation of U.S. aggression in Viet Nam, but each time the objective they have in mind is "improvement of the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States" and they try to bring all world problems within the orbit of "Soviet-U.S. co-operation".

Similarly, they are unable to explain the contradictions between their statements and their actions.

Since they assert that, together with the people of the world, they will oppose U.S. imperialism, why do they maintain close contact, strengthen their collaboration and exchange information with it, and work in mutual understanding against the revolutionary struggles of the people?

Since they assert that they will support the national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America, why do they want to conspire with the United States to set up a permanent U.N. force, to organize an international gendar-

[1] Commentator's article in *Izvestia*, November 5, 1964.

[2] Gromyko's speech at the United Nations General Assembly, December 7, 1964.

merie for the suppression of the people's revolutionary struggles?

Since they assert that they will strengthen the unity of the fraternal Parties and countries, why have they taken an extremely grave step to split the international communist movement by convening the schismatic March meeting?

Since they assert that they will improve their relations with the fraternal Parties and countries, why do they persist in the policy of great-power chauvinism which Khrushchov adopted towards Albania and refuse to admit their mistakes? Why do they continue their anti-Chinese propaganda and activities at home and abroad, and even give that U.S. favourite, Shastri, the platform of the Kremlin from which to vilify China? Why do they keep on trying to subvert and disrupt the Japanese Communist Party, the Indonesian Communist Party, and other Marxist-Leninist fraternal Parties, and even give open support to such renegades from the Japanese Communist Party as Yoshio Shiga and do their utmost to help Shigeo Kamiyama in his election campaign?

Finally, they are unable to explain the contradictions in their own actions. While making some gestures of aid to Viet Nam, they have divulged their "aid" plans to the Americans in advance and have been busy in Washington, London and Paris trying to bring about peace negotiations, in a painstaking effort to find a "way out" for the U.S. aggressors. Does not this precisely confirm our repeated exposure of the fact that they are trying to capitalize on their "aid" to Viet Nam and to bring the Viet Nam question within the orbit of U.S.-Soviet co-operation? Certain remarks made by the U.S. imperialists should give food for deep thought. They have said that the shipment of Soviet weapons to Viet Nam is an "encouraging element" and will have a "moderating effect". And they added that "the direct confrontation of American and Soviet forces . . . might even hasten negotiations for a settlement in Viet Nam".[1]

[1] *Washington Post*, April 17, 1965.

In a nutshell, there are both real and sham features in all this self-contradictory behaviour of the new leaders of the CPSU, some features being real and others sham. Some phenomena reveal the very essence of things and are real; other phenomena do not and are sham. For all their cheap stage tricks and deceptive writings, in none of their changes have the new leaders of the CPSU departed from their essence, namely, Khrushchov revisionism, splittism and great-power chauvinism, and Soviet-U.S. co-operation for the domination of the world. But compared with Khrushchov, they are practising a more covert, more cunning and more dangerous revisionism.

This is how things often happen in history. The reactionary, moribund forces craftily take over progressive, revolutionary slogans as signboards for deceiving the masses and for accomplishing their own reactionary purposes. The revisionists of the Second International used the signboard of "Marxism" to betray the proletarian revolution. The Mensheviks took over Bolshevik slogans concerning the Soviets and attempted to establish a bourgeois dictatorship. Tito practises capitalism in the guise of "socialism". Today, the new leaders of the CPSU are playing the same old trick. Taking over some of the slogans of the Marxist-Leninists, they are putting up a facade in order to conceal the essence of their continued pursuance of the revisionist line.

The class struggle is very complex, and the external appearances of events in the course of this struggle are even more so. To get to the essence behind the complicated appearances, we have to work conscientiously, to eliminate the false and retain the true and proceed from outward appearance to inner essence. Only by grasping the essence can we acquire a relatively deep and correct understanding of objective things in their totality. Marxism-Leninism serves us both as a telescope and as a microscope; it helps us to penetrate beyond the appearance of things and grasp their essence. After dealing with Khrushchov revisionism for quite

a number of years we have become a little wiser. Our experience in discerning Khrushchov as he really was has made it easier for us to see the true nature of his successors without being misled by the false appearances they put on.

The question confronting the Chinese Communists today is whether to carry the struggle against Khrushchov revisionism through to the end or whether to stop halfway.

To gain a breathing space, to recuperate, and to accumulate capital for a redoubled effort in pushing revisionism, the Khrushchov revisionists are using every possible means to blur the dividing line between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism and are trying in vain to halt the struggle against revisionism. We must do the exact opposite; we must continue our triumphant pursuit and firmly carry forward the fight against Khrushchov revisionism to the very end.

Of late, the new leaders of the CPSU have been loud in chanting honeyed words such as "unity". One must not just think it ridiculous that the selfsame people who disrupted the unity of the international communist movement by brazenly calling the schismatic March meeting are now harping on "unity" today. There is more to it than just ridiculousness. They have a despicable aim. They are trying to capitalize on the aspirations of the people of the world for the closer unity of the revolutionary forces in face of the U.S. imperialists' rabid aggression. Under the pressure of events the new leaders of the CPSU have had to change their tactics. Unlike Khrushchov, who adopted the open, naked, crude and high-handed policy of forcing the fraternal Parties to submit to his revisionist line, they are pretending to be quite accommodating and to care for overall interests, in their attempt to sap the militant will of Marxist-Leninists in fighting against revisionism. To put it bluntly, by "unity" they mean that we should refrain from combating and exposing revisionism and should follow their revisionist practices, or at least leave them a free hand in such practices.

In our struggle against the revisionists, we must be able to deal both with their tough and with their soft tactics, we must dare to resist all their pressure and must refuse to be misled by any of their fine words. In the past, we were not afraid to oppose Khrushchov despite all kinds of pressure. We were fully aware that he would reply by exerting more pressure, yet we persisted in our principled struggle. Today, too, we should not be misled by the various guises and tricks of Khrushchov's successors and give up our principled struggle. On the contrary, we should be still firmer in our stand and raise our banner still higher.

The Chinese Communist Party is a Marxist-Leninist Party, a serious and principled Party. Marxist-Leninists have always maintained that "a policy based on principle is the only correct policy". It is correct to exercise the necessary flexibility in struggle, as long as this is done on the basis of principle. But flexibility should serve principle. It would be wrong to exercise unprincipled flexibility, to create ambiguity and confusion on questions of principle on the pretext of flexibility. There are clearly a series of fundamental differences of principle between us and the Khrushchov revisionists. The Khrushchov revisionists have completely transposed enemies and friends. If we were to abandon our principled stand and accommodate ourselves or yield to the Khrushchov revisionists, that would amount to whitewashing them, helping them deceive the people of the Soviet Union, of the other socialist countries and of the whole world, and to joining these revisionists in rendering service to imperialism; it would be a grave historical mistake. If we did that, the international proletariat and the revolutionary people of the world would never forgive us.

For quite a long period we refrained from publicly refuting Khrushchov revisionism. While keeping to our principled stand, we made concessions to Khrushchov on certain questions. Our purpose was to bring the leaders of the CPSU back to the road of Marxism-Leninism. But they returned

evil for good. In one of our articles commenting on the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the CPSU, we expressed our readiness to accept criticism from comrades of fraternal Parties if they asked us why we had not let them know the truth about the differences and why we had made concessions to Khrushchov on certain questions. For us this is an important historical lesson in the struggle against revisionism.

We had hopes regarding the new leaders of the CPSU, and watched and waited for several months. But they soon revealed their true colours and expressed their determination to continue along the path of revisionism. In these circumstances, we must firmly defend the ideological positions of Marxism-Leninism and persist in our tit-for-tat struggle against Khrushchov revisionism.

The struggle against Khrushchov revisionism has a vital bearing on the future of the international communist movement, the development of the people's revolutionary struggle and the fate of mankind.

Revisionism has always been a force hostile to and disruptive of the revolution. To make revolutions or to support revolutions, it is imperative to carry the struggle against Khrushchov revisionism through to the end.

Revisionism has always been a social prop of imperialism, a force serving imperialism. To combat imperialism, and above all U.S. imperialism, it is imperative to carry the struggle against Khrushchov revisionism through to the end.

Revisionism has invariably engaged in splitting activities against Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary people, has invariably been a force sapping revolutionary unity. To safeguard the unity of the international communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and to safeguard the unity of the revolutionary people of the world, it is imperative to carry the struggle against Khrushchov revisionism through to the end.

The struggle against modern revisionism has won great victories in the last two years. Of course, this struggle is a

protracted one, and some twists and turns and difficulties are unavoidable. But it is quite certain that Marxism-Leninism will triumph over revisionism in the end. This is proved by what has already happened and will also be confirmed in the future.

The Khrushchov revisionists are confronted with innumerable contradictions. They cannot resolve their contradiction with the Soviet people, Soviet Party members and cadres, who constitute over 90 per cent of the Soviet population, nor can they resolve their contradiction with the masses of the people and the Marxist-Leninists of all countries, who constitute over 90 per cent of the population of the world. They can neither resolve the contradiction between the great Soviet people who are determined to follow the socialist road and U.S. imperialism, nor the contradiction within the ranks of the revisionists themselves. It was precisely these irreconcilable contradictions that wrecked Khrushchov's political career. Those who follow in his footsteps will not be able to avoid the same fate.

The forces of Marxism-Leninism have grown immensely in the struggle against Khrushchov revisionism, and particularly so since the beginning of the open polemics. Never have the revolutionary teachings of Marxism-Leninism been so widely propagated. The Marxist-Leninist ranks have undergone a new tempering. As we carry the anti-revisionist struggle forward today, we benefit from Lenin's experience in opposing the revisionists of the Second International, from Stalin's experience in opposing Trotsky and Bukharin and from the experience already gained in combating modern revisionism, and Khrushchov revisionism in particular. We must make full use of all these favourable factors and firmly combat Khrushchov revisionism without Khrushchov.

The task of the Marxist-Leninists is to know the world and to change it. It is through mastery of the laws of historical development, through reliance on the strength of the masses and through revolutionary struggle that Marxist-Leninists push

the wheel of history forward. But the revisionists go against the laws of historical development; they side with the reactionary and decaying forces, set themselves against the people, oppose revolutionary struggle and try to hold back the wheel of history. As Lenin said, "the winner in the long run is the side which has the force of historical development behind it".[1] We have boundless confidence in the complete victory of the struggle against Khrushchov revisionism.

The Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people will unswervingly follow the general line of the international communist movement which we proposed two years ago. We will raise still higher the invincible banner of Marxism-Leninism and, together with the Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary people of the whole world, we will carry forward to the end the struggle against imperialism and reaction headed by the United States, carry forward to the end the struggle against Khrushchov revisionism, and strive for the triumph of the cause of world peace, national liberation, people's democracy and socialism, and for a new world without imperialism, without capitalism and without the exploitation of man by man.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "The Tsar Against the Finnish People", *Collected Works*, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1963, Vol. XVI, p. 80.

把反对赫鲁晓夫修正主义的斗爭进行到底
——紀念《关于国際共产主义运动
总路綫的建議》發表兩周年
*
外文出版社出版（北京）
1965年第一版
編号：（英）3050—1244
00014
3—E—705P

N-THE-20TH-CENTURY-----0172047-----

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

HX 632 A1 W9 no.99
World communism in the 20th century.

0172047A MAIN

99

Date Due

1965年第一版
編号：（英）3050—1244
00014
3—E—705P

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

HX 632 A1 W9 no.99
World communism in the 20th century.

0172047A MAIN

99